

## NOTES FROM LONDON.

## PERSONAL, LITERARY, ARTISTIC.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 12. Admiral Nicholson was here in London for a few days, and sailed last week for New-York in the steamship *Spain*. He turned over his command to Admiral Baldwin a month ago. At the same time he completed his forty-fifth year of continuous service in the United States Navy, and thereupon retired in accordance with the law for such cases made and founded. He leaves, I suppose, no more capable officer behind him; few or none who have served more brilliantly and honorably or had a more varied career. It happens, if I may say so much of myself, that I was with Admiral Nicholson for a short time on his first command—the gunboat *Isaac Smith*—in which I sailed up Warsaw Sound with him, now twenty-one years ago. I went down to Southampton the other day, and on board the *Lancaster*, then flying his flag, and so was with him for an hour or two on his last as well as on his first ship. In the interval I had never seen him, but I knew his history, as I hope all good Americans know it, for it is bound up with the honor of the country.

From Admiral Nicholson and from some of his officers (one of them, Captain Gherardi, I had last known at school) I heard accounts of what happened in July at Alexandria when, as the story ran in England, the *Lancaster* cheered the British fleet on to the bombardment, and when, after the fleet was over, the Admiral landed some of his blue-jackets and marines to help restore order in the burning city. I am not going over the story now, but there was a single point which will, I think, make an impression on others as it did on me. What was done by our ships and men during those eventful days made its mark on Anglo-American history. Once more the English felt and said that blood is thicker than water. The two nations came closer to each other. The cheers from the *Lancaster*, the little armed American force that stood by the not much bigger British force then facing an army ten times its strength, once again reminded the English, and reminded us, that we are after all one nation and not two. Well, my point is this: I don't think that what may be called the sentimental side of these transactions so much as occurred to Admiral Nicholson at the time. From his own story and from those of his officers, it was quite clear that he understood himself to be in the harbor of Alexandria to carry out his instructions as an officer of the American Government, and did it. If the blue-jackets cheered, it was because they felt like it. If the band played, it was usual for bands of ships of war to play as they pass each other. If the Admiral landed a force, the object of landing it was, primarily, to re-establish the American Consulate. On the other hand, the cheering and band-playing, it is safe to say, would not have occurred if they had been displeasing to Admiral Nicholson. The officer who commanded the American marines and sailors on shore, whatever his formal instructions may have been, perfectly understood that he was to lend the British a hand so far as he could, and the services actually performed, of that gallant little company were of the most practical and valuable character. And so it turns out that an American Admiral, without doing his strict duty to his own country, conferred an obligation on the country of his ancestors, and drew closer the ties that bind the people of England and the people of America together to-day.

Perhaps it is not less characteristic of Admiral Nicholson that he avoids even the natural occasion for anything like English recognition of his services. He passes through London on his way home, but his coming has been so quiet that the papers did not find it out, nor was it known to the English naval authorities or to his English friends. While the *Lancaster* was lying in Southampton water, the Admiral declined all invitations. When he arrived in London he seems to have called on nobody but his own countrymen. He took up his quarters in a private hotel, in a quarter remote from clubs and the official world. Perhaps the state of his health had something to do with this, for he was suffering, I am sorry to say, from gout. But the suggestion that anybody in England might care to see him was obviously a surprise to him. He dined at the American Legation, but the party was wholly American. In short, a man whom the London world would have been delighted to lionize has slipped through their fingers and gone quietly home. There is a touch of the dignity of other days about this which makes it none the less interesting.

The Earl of Dalhousie, a young nobleman of whom you heard something as Lord Ramsay, and will certainly hear more by his present title, underwent last Friday a severe surgical operation—severe enough to keep him two hours etherized. He is now regaining strength, but will be confined to his bed for some weeks. His successful contest for Liverpool in 1880 gave him a position in the House of Commons which the death of his father, a few months later, and his succession to the peerage, deprived him of prematurely. But he has become known in the House of Lords as one of the few really Liberal Peers whom that body contains; as a man with a power of thinking for himself about politics, and of looking beyond the precincts of the Chamber or the interests of his order. In Scotland, too, where they know a man of abilities when they see him, Lord Dalhousie has made a name for himself, and is looked upon as sure of a distinguished future. He can speak. I heard him full of good sense, individuality, clear views, with a way of putting things which his audience found attractive and persuasive. This surgical business, though of a grim nature, is now understood, well over and fine and lasting with expected to be the result of it; a result sincerely hoped for by all sorts and conditions of men.

Mrs. Frances Butler Leigh's "Ten Years on a Georgia Plantation" has been reviewed by the English press in various tones. The *Pall Mall Gazette* to-day describes it as melancholy for every possible point of view, but instead of drawing from it Mrs. Leigh's intended moral, that the negro is hopeless, infers that it is the ex-slave—owning the territory of the South which is hopeless. The members of this aristocracy, in other words, have learned nothing and forgotten nothing since the war. Mrs. Butler evidently believed, after the fighting was over, that things would come round to the old fashion, with only a few thousand freedmen more. Says her English critic in a striking sentence: "An immense wave of social revolution had passed over the land; a whole aristocratic system had been dissolved by a stroke of Lincoln's pen, followed by a sweep of Sherman's sword; the negro of Georgia had emerged at one step from more than medieval serfdom to modern equal citizenship; and the Butler family went placidly back to St. Simon's, expecting to get in the ordinary cotton crop as if nothing unusual had occurred meanwhile."

This review, as a whole, shows an unusually accurate knowledge of the state of things in the South under the reign of emancipation; knowledge of negro character included.

Mr. A. H. Haig's remarkable etching of the very remarkable Mont St. Michel has lately been published by Mr. Robert Dunthorne, of Vigo-st. The size of the plate, exclusive of margin, is 34½ by 24½ inches, which is also remarkable. But Mr. Haig's work has much more to be more to be recommended to the lover of etching and of architecture. A view of the world-famous rock off the coast of Normandy is here given from base to summit; the sea, the sands, the ramparts, the houses clinging to the steep slope, and the noble abbey crowning the whole. Mr. Haig's power of dealing with architectural work has been shown before by his views of Chartres Cathedral. Here he has tried landscape and architecture together on a scale which makes his work a disastrous failure if it be not a success. There can be no question of his success in producing a most interesting picture; open to criticism on some technical points as an example of etching, but penetrated throughout with right and adequate feeling for this magnificent monument of the genius of other days. To use a word only too often misused of late, this

print is of an exceedingly decorative kind. It is something far better than that; a faithful record of the actual scene. On the whole, a second and admirable piece of work. Five hundred impressions will be taken off on Whitman paper, each impression signed by Mr. Haig, the plate then to be destroyed. This is in gratifying contrast to the now common practice of "stealing" plates, and pouring out upon the public prints without number, of which it may be feared copies are not seldom disposed of to the advantage of "artists' proofs." The purchaser of Mr. Haig's Mont St. Michel has an assurance that the number of copies is limited and can never be increased. A printed notice of Mont St. Michel is also issued by Mr. Dunthorne, the text by Mr. Haig, with a sketch-etching; a rather sumptuous piece of Chiswick Press typography in the Old English or black letter manner.

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and immediately after a second time, upon which a motion was made and carried that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House went into committee. Each clause was separately agreed to in committee, two or three of them eliciting brief comment but no real opposition. The whole bill, without amendment of any kind, was then ordered to be reported to the House, the Speaker resumed the chair, and the bill was at once read a third time and passed. The time occupied in these proceedings was an hour and a half. There is no modern precedent for such celerity, except in the case of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act in 1860, nor was that act passed so quickly as this. Sir William Harcourt went to the other chamber where it had not been intended to take the Explosives bill till to-day, and privately urged the importance of its immediate passage. The Lords were then engaged in a debate on India, and the debate ran its course. Upon its conclusion, Lord Kimberley moved the suspension of the standing orders of the House. Three or four five-minute speeches were made on that motion; it was agreed to, the bill was read a first and second time, committee was dispensed with, the third reading followed, and the bill was passed and ready to receive the royal assent, which will be given at noon to-day.

What is the bill? Undoubtedly one of the most stringent measures ever framed to prevent a particular crime. It is a measure of considerable length, fills a column of print, and bears marks of rapid composition, if grammatical errors in a Parliamentary act can be deemed marks of haste, in which case it must be inferred that a great many acts are prepared in haste. Sir William Harcourt's speech in introducing the bill may be commended to the student of forensic or legislative oratory as a remarkable example of terse, clear, impressive, and even decisive statement. It contains not a word of declamation, not a sentence that could be construed as an appeal to passion; is throughout dignified and penetrated with a spirit of just sternness. No many men are now in a mood for trifling; least of all the men on whom more than any other rests the responsibility of protecting society against Irish assassins and Irish agents of wholesale destruction. There is an act in existence known as the Explosives Act of 1875, and it is under this act that the men already arrested—Whitehead, Gallagher and others—have been charged and under this act that they can be punished. It was not framed or passed with any view to such a state of things as now exists. Its main object was to provide against the careless handling and accumulation of dangerous explosives. It did not anticipate—nobody then anticipated—the use of dynamite on a great scale for great crimes. The definitions of the act of 1875 are so various that anybody under it may, with a little easy caution, commit crime with impunity. Its penalties are ludicrously inadequate. The possession of explosives with intent to commit a felony is a misdemeanor, punishable by two years' imprisonment, and that is all Whitehead and his accomplices can be awarded, unless they can be convicted of conspiracy alone. For all future purposes that act may be put aside, and this new one becomes law in its stead.

The new law creates three grades of offences. First, any person who maliciously causes an explosion likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property is declared guilty of felony, and punishable by penal servitude for life, whether life be lost or property injured or not. Secondly, any person doing any act or being in possession of any explosive with intent to cause an explosion, whether the explosion occur or not, may be punished by penal servitude for twenty years. Third, any person in possession of an explosive under circumstances of reasonable suspicion is liable to penal servitude for fourteen years.

These are the three classes of offences and of punishments. But the act does not stop there. It goes on to provide means not only of punishing, but of detecting and preventing crimes of this hideous character. It makes every man, I should premise, who supplies or solicits money for such purposes, or who counsels, aids or abets in the commission of the crime, guilty of felony and liable to exactly the same punishment as the principal. The machinery for detecting criminals is borrowed in part from the Criminal Act for Ireland—the same under which the Phoenix Park murders have been traced. It gives power to order an inquiry—what the Parnellites call an inquiry—compelling witnesses to attend and testify, examining them in private, taking depositions, extracting those about to abscond. And there are very wide and comprehensive sections with reference to search, to what shall be deemed explosives, and to the power of masters of vessels to break open suspicious packages.

Some of Sir William Harcourt's observations are of hardly less interest than the bill itself. The tribute to the police in this business has shown an intelligence, zeal and courage for which they can hardly be too much praised. They have redeemed its detective department from a reproach only too well deserved on some previous oc-

casions. They were aptly described as the first line of defence against the new danger; against the organized band of men, some of them in the higher walks of life, banded together like the assassins of the East, whose avowed object is to collect money for general murder and for the burning down of civilized towns. Really some of these interesting persons in the higher walks of life in America will be taken off on Whitman paper, each impression signed by Mr. Haig, the plate then to be destroyed. This is in gratifying contrast to the now common practice of "stealing" plates, and pouring out upon the public prints without number, of which it may be feared copies are not seldom disposed of to the advantage of "artists' proofs." The purchaser of Mr. Haig's Mont St. Michel has an assurance that the number of copies is limited and can never be increased. A printed notice of Mont St. Michel is also issued by Mr. Dunthorne, the text by Mr. Haig, with a sketch-etching; a rather sumptuous piece of Chiswick Press typography in the Old English or black letter manner.

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and immediately after a second time, upon which a motion was made and carried that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House went into committee. Each clause was separately agreed to in committee, two or three of them eliciting brief comment but no real opposition. The whole bill, without amendment of any kind, was then ordered to be reported to the House, the Speaker resumed the chair, and the bill was at once read a third time and passed. The time occupied in these proceedings was an hour and a half. There is no modern precedent for such celerity, except in the case of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act in 1860, nor was that act passed so quickly as this. Sir William Harcourt went to the other chamber where it had not been intended to take the Explosives bill till to-day, and privately urged the importance of its immediate passage. The Lords were then engaged in a debate on India, and the debate ran its course. Upon its conclusion, Lord Kimberley moved the suspension of the standing orders of the House. Three or four five-minute speeches were made on that motion; it was agreed to, the bill was read a first and second time, committee was dispensed with, the third reading followed, and the bill was passed and ready to receive the royal assent, which will be given at noon to-day.

What is the bill? Undoubtedly one of the most stringent measures ever framed to prevent a particular crime. It is a measure of considerable length, fills a column of print, and bears marks of rapid composition, if grammatical errors in a Parliamentary act can be deemed marks of haste, in which case it must be inferred that a great many acts are prepared in haste. Sir William Harcourt's speech in introducing the bill may be commended to the student of forensic or legislative oratory as a remarkable example of terse, clear, impressive, and even decisive statement. It contains not a word of declamation, not a sentence that could be construed as an appeal to passion; is throughout dignified and penetrated with a spirit of just sternness. No many men are now in a mood for trifling; least of all the men on whom more than any other rests the responsibility of protecting society against Irish assassins and Irish agents of wholesale destruction. There is an act in existence known as the Explosives Act of 1875, and it is under this act that the men already arrested—Whitehead, Gallagher and others—have been charged and under this act that they can be punished. It was not framed or passed with any view to such a state of things as now exists. Its main object was to provide against the careless handling and accumulation of dangerous explosives. It did not anticipate—nobody then anticipated—the use of dynamite on a great scale for great crimes. The definitions of the act of 1875 are so various that anybody under it may, with a little easy caution, commit crime with impunity. Its penalties are ludicrously inadequate. The possession of explosives with intent to commit a felony is a misdemeanor, punishable by two years' imprisonment, and that is all Whitehead and his accomplices can be awarded, unless they can be convicted of conspiracy alone. For all future purposes that act may be put aside, and this new one becomes law in its stead.

The new law creates three grades of offences. First, any person who maliciously causes an explosion likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property is declared guilty of felony, and punishable by penal servitude for life, whether life be lost or property injured or not. Secondly, any person doing any act or being in possession of any explosive with intent to cause an explosion, whether the explosion occur or not, may be punished by penal servitude for twenty years. Third, any person in possession of an explosive under circumstances of reasonable suspicion is liable to penal servitude for fourteen years.

These are the three classes of offences and of punishments. But the act does not stop there. It goes on to provide means not only of punishing, but of detecting and preventing crimes of this hideous character. It makes every man, I should premise, who supplies or solicits money for such purposes, or who counsels, aids or abets in the commission of the crime, guilty of felony and liable to exactly the same punishment as the principal. The machinery for detecting criminals is borrowed in part from the Criminal Act for Ireland—the same under which the Phoenix Park murders have been traced. It gives power to order an inquiry—what the Parnellites call an inquiry—compelling witnesses to attend and testify, examining them in private, taking depositions, extracting those about to abscond. And there are very wide and comprehensive sections with reference to search, to what shall be deemed explosives, and to the power of masters of vessels to break open suspicious packages.

Some of Sir William Harcourt's observations are of hardly less interest than the bill itself. The tribute to the police in this business has shown an intelligence, zeal and courage for which they can hardly be too much praised. They have redeemed its detective department from a reproach only too well deserved on some previous oc-

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and immediately after a second time, upon which a motion was made and carried that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House went into committee. Each clause was separately agreed to in committee, two or three of them eliciting brief comment but no real opposition. The whole bill, without amendment of any kind, was then ordered to be reported to the House, the Speaker resumed the chair, and the bill was at once read a third time and passed. The time occupied in these proceedings was an hour and a half. There is no modern precedent for such celerity, except in the case of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act in 1860, nor was that act passed so quickly as this. Sir William Harcourt went to the other chamber where it had not been intended to take the Explosives bill till to-day, and privately urged the importance of its immediate passage. The Lords were then engaged in a debate on India, and the debate ran its course. Upon its conclusion, Lord Kimberley moved the suspension of the standing orders of the House. Three or four five-minute speeches were made on that motion; it was agreed to, the bill was read a first and second time, committee was dispensed with, the third reading followed, and the bill was passed and ready to receive the royal assent, which will be given at noon to-day.

What is the bill? Undoubtedly one of the most stringent measures ever framed to prevent a particular crime. It is a measure of considerable length, fills a column of print, and bears marks of rapid composition, if grammatical errors in a Parliamentary act can be deemed marks of haste, in which case it must be inferred that a great many acts are prepared in haste. Sir William Harcourt's speech in introducing the bill may be commended to the student of forensic or legislative oratory as a remarkable example of terse, clear, impressive, and even decisive statement. It contains not a word of declamation, not a sentence that could be construed as an appeal to passion; is throughout dignified and penetrated with a spirit of just sternness. No many men are now in a mood for trifling; least of all the men on whom more than any other rests the responsibility of protecting society against Irish assassins and Irish agents of wholesale destruction. There is an act in existence known as the Explosives Act of 1875, and it is under this act that the men already arrested—Whitehead, Gallagher and others—have been charged and under this act that they can be punished. It was not framed or passed with any view to such a state of things as now exists. Its main object was to provide against the careless handling and accumulation of dangerous explosives. It did not anticipate—nobody then anticipated—the use of dynamite on a great scale for great crimes. The definitions of the act of 1875 are so various that anybody under it may, with a little easy caution, commit crime with impunity. Its penalties are ludicrously inadequate. The possession of explosives with intent to commit a felony is a misdemeanor, punishable by two years' imprisonment, and that is all Whitehead and his accomplices can be awarded, unless they can be convicted of conspiracy alone. For all future purposes that act may be put aside, and this new one becomes law in its stead.

The new law creates three grades of offences. First, any person who maliciously causes an explosion likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property is declared guilty of felony, and punishable by penal servitude for life, whether life be lost or property injured or not. Secondly, any person doing any act or being in possession of any explosive with intent to cause an explosion, whether the explosion occur or not, may be punished by penal servitude for twenty years. Third, any person in possession of an explosive under circumstances of reasonable suspicion is liable to penal servitude for fourteen years.

These are the three classes of offences and of punishments. But the act does not stop there. It goes on to provide means not only of punishing, but of detecting and preventing crimes of this hideous character. It makes every man, I should premise, who supplies or solicits money for such purposes, or who counsels, aids or abets in the commission of the crime, guilty of felony and liable to exactly the same punishment as the principal. The machinery for detecting criminals is borrowed in part from the Criminal Act for Ireland—the same under which the Phoenix Park murders have been traced. It gives power to order an inquiry—what the Parnellites call an inquiry—compelling witnesses to attend and testify, examining them in private, taking depositions, extracting those about to abscond. And there are very wide and comprehensive sections with reference to search, to what shall be deemed explosives, and to the power of masters of vessels to break open suspicious packages.

Some of Sir William Harcourt's observations are of hardly less interest than the bill itself. The tribute to the police in this business has shown an intelligence, zeal and courage for which they can hardly be too much praised. They have redeemed its detective department from a reproach only too well deserved on some previous oc-

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and immediately after a second time, upon which a motion was made and carried that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House went into committee. Each clause was separately agreed to in committee, two or three of them eliciting brief comment but no real opposition. The whole bill, without amendment of any kind, was then ordered to be reported to the House, the Speaker resumed the chair, and the bill was at once read a third time and passed. The time occupied in these proceedings was an hour and a half. There is no modern precedent for such celerity, except in the case of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act in 1860, nor was that act passed so quickly as this. Sir William Harcourt went to the other chamber where it had not been intended to take the Explosives bill till to-day, and privately urged the importance of its immediate passage. The Lords were then engaged in a debate on India, and the debate ran its course. Upon its conclusion, Lord Kimberley moved the suspension of the standing orders of the House. Three or four five-minute speeches were made on that motion; it was agreed to, the bill was read a first and second time, committee was dispensed with, the third reading followed, and the bill was passed and ready to receive the royal assent, which will be given at noon to-day.

What is the bill? Undoubtedly one of the most stringent measures ever framed to prevent a particular crime. It is a measure of considerable length, fills a column of print, and bears marks of rapid composition, if grammatical errors in a Parliamentary act can be deemed marks of haste, in which case it must be inferred that a great many acts are prepared in haste. Sir William Harcourt's speech in introducing the bill may be commended to the student of forensic or legislative oratory as a remarkable example of terse, clear, impressive, and even decisive statement. It contains not a word of declamation, not a sentence that could be construed as an appeal to passion; is throughout dignified and penetrated with a spirit of just sternness. No many men are now in a mood for trifling; least of all the men on whom more than any other rests the responsibility of protecting society against Irish assassins and Irish agents of wholesale destruction. There is an act in existence known as the Explosives Act of 1875, and it is under this act that the men already arrested—Whitehead, Gallagher and others—have been charged and under this act that they can be punished. It was not framed or passed with any view to such a state of things as now exists. Its main object was to provide against the careless handling and accumulation of dangerous explosives. It did not anticipate—nobody then anticipated—the use of dynamite on a great scale for great crimes. The definitions of the act of 1875 are so various that anybody under it may, with a little easy caution, commit crime with impunity. Its penalties are ludicrously inadequate. The possession of explosives with intent to commit a felony is a misdemeanor, punishable by two years' imprisonment, and that is all Whitehead and his accomplices can be awarded, unless they can be convicted of conspiracy alone. For all future purposes that act may be put aside, and this new one becomes law in its stead.

The new law creates three grades of offences. First, any person who maliciously causes an explosion likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property is declared guilty of felony, and punishable by penal servitude for life, whether life be lost or property injured or not. Secondly, any person doing any act or being in possession of any explosive with intent to cause an explosion, whether the explosion occur or not, may be punished by penal servitude for twenty years. Third, any person in possession of an explosive under circumstances of reasonable suspicion is liable to penal servitude for fourteen years.

These are the three classes of offences and of punishments. But the act does not stop there. It goes on to provide means not only of punishing, but of detecting and preventing crimes of this hideous character. It makes every man, I should premise, who supplies or solicits money for such purposes, or who counsels, aids or abets in the commission of the crime, guilty of felony and liable to exactly the same punishment as the principal. The machinery for detecting criminals is borrowed in part from the Criminal Act for Ireland—the same under which the Phoenix Park murders have been traced. It gives power to order an inquiry—what the Parnellites call an inquiry—compelling witnesses to attend and testify, examining them in private, taking depositions, extracting those about to abscond. And there are very wide and comprehensive sections with reference to search, to what shall be deemed explosives, and to the power of masters of vessels to break open suspicious packages.

Some of Sir William Harcourt's observations are of hardly less interest than the bill itself. The tribute to the police in this business has shown an intelligence, zeal and courage for which they can hardly be too much praised. They have redeemed its detective department from a reproach only too well deserved on some previous oc-

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and immediately after a second time, upon which a motion was made and carried that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House went into committee. Each clause was separately agreed to in committee, two or three of them eliciting brief comment but no real opposition. The whole bill, without amendment of any kind, was then ordered to be reported to the House, the Speaker resumed the chair, and the bill was at once read a third time and passed. The time occupied in these proceedings was an hour and a half. There is no modern precedent for such celerity, except in the case of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus act in 1860, nor was that act passed so quickly as this. Sir William Harcourt went to the other chamber where it had not been intended to take the Explosives bill till to-day, and privately urged the importance of its immediate passage. The Lords were then engaged in a debate on India, and the debate ran its course. Upon its conclusion, Lord Kimberley moved the suspension of the standing orders of the House. Three or four five-minute speeches were made on that motion; it was agreed to, the bill was read a first and second time, committee was dispensed with, the third reading followed, and the bill was passed and ready to receive the royal assent, which will be given at noon to-day.

What is the bill? Undoubtedly one of the most stringent measures ever framed to prevent a particular crime. It is a measure of considerable length, fills a column of print, and bears marks of rapid composition, if grammatical errors in a Parliamentary act can be deemed marks of haste, in which case it must be inferred that a great many acts are prepared in haste. Sir William Harcourt's speech in introducing the bill may be commended to the student of forensic or legislative oratory as a remarkable example of terse, clear, impressive, and even decisive statement. It contains not a word of declamation, not a sentence that could be construed as an appeal to passion; is throughout dignified and penetrated with a spirit of just sternness. No many men are now in a mood for trifling; least of all the men on whom more than any other rests the responsibility of protecting society against Irish assassins and Irish agents of wholesale destruction. There is an act in existence known as the Explosives Act of 1875, and it is under this act that the men already arrested—Whitehead, Gallagher and others—have been charged and under this act that they can be punished. It was not framed or passed with any view to such a state of things as now exists. Its main object was to provide against the careless handling and accumulation of dangerous explosives. It did not anticipate—nobody then anticipated—the use of dynamite on a great scale for great crimes. The definitions of the act of 1875 are so various that anybody under it may, with a little easy caution, commit crime with impunity. Its penalties are ludicrously inadequate. The possession of explosives with intent to commit a felony is a misdemeanor, punishable by two years' imprisonment, and that is all Whitehead and his accomplices can be awarded, unless they can be convicted of conspiracy alone. For all future purposes that act may be put aside, and this new one becomes law in its stead.

The new law creates three grades of offences. First, any person who maliciously causes an explosion likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property is declared guilty of felony, and punishable by penal servitude for life, whether life be lost or property injured or not. Secondly, any person doing any act or being in possession of any explosive with intent to cause an explosion, whether the explosion occur or not, may be punished by penal servitude for twenty years. Third, any person in possession of an explosive under circumstances of reasonable suspicion is liable to penal servitude for fourteen years.

These are the three classes of offences and of punishments. But the act does not stop there. It goes on to provide means not only of punishing, but of detecting and preventing crimes of this hideous character. It makes every man, I should premise, who supplies or solicits money for such purposes, or who counsels, aids or abets in the commission of the crime, guilty of felony and liable to exactly the same punishment as the principal. The machinery for detecting criminals is borrowed in part from the Criminal Act for Ireland—the same under which the Phoenix Park murders have been traced. It gives power to order an inquiry—what the Parnellites call an inquiry—compelling witnesses to attend and testify, examining them in private, taking depositions, extracting those about to abscond. And there are very wide and comprehensive sections with reference to search, to what shall be deemed explosives, and to the power of masters of vessels to break open suspicious packages.

Some of Sir William Harcourt's observations are of hardly less interest than the bill itself. The tribute to the police in this business has shown an intelligence, zeal and courage for which they can hardly be too much praised. They have redeemed its detective department from a reproach only too well deserved on some previous oc-

I am asked to say that there will be an Exhibition of Sanitary Domestic Appliances, Hygienic Dress and Decorations at Humphreys's Hall, Albert Gate, London, beginning June 2, and continuing a fortnight. The exhibition is held under the management of the National Health Society; the manager is Mr. E. J. Powell, to whom application should be addressed at the hall above named, or at No. 44, Berners-st. "We shall be exceedingly glad," writes Mr. Powell, "to show American inventions in either or all of the classes of exhibits." The chairman of the committee is Mr. Ernest Hart, a well-known medical and sanitary writer. The Princess Christian and the Duchess of Westminster are patronesses, and the committee includes Lord Derby, the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, Mr. Spencer Wells, president of the College of Surgeons, Professor Norman Lockyer, and many others of high position and particular authority in such matters.

G. W. S.

## THE DYNAMITE LAW.

(FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.)

LONDON, April 10. Probably no such sitting of both Houses of Parliament has been known as that of yesterday, in which the Explosives bill was passed. The circumstances under which they met were without precedent. The spirit in which they did their work, if not without precedent, was, with an exception to be presently mentioned, suited to the gravity of the occasion. Certainly it is characteristic of English temper that the known urgency of the danger to be met did not induce either House to depart from its usual forms. In the House of Commons at the opening petitions were presented and questions asked, each in rather unusual numbers; then, pursuant to notice, the orders of the day were postponed. The House Secretary rose at once to state the provisions of his new measure. At the end of his speech he moved for leave to bring in the bill. The House Secretary under the late Government, Sir Richard Cross, spoke briefly, with just so much criticism as an Opposition leader feels bound to make. The House then agreed to the motion for bringing in the bill, which was at once read a first time and